



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

annuement (p. 341), *Amstbewerbung* (p. 342), *Perhaebia* (p. 348), *Fluvius* (p. 350). We welcome his work as a distinct contribution to historical study—of value both to the student of Roman history and to the student of ancient law.

IV. The last of the four dissertations is literary in character. Miss Woodruff has industriously gathered together from the *Punica* of Silius Italicus every possible passage or phrase that may seem to have any possible similarity in sound or sense to anything in the extant fragments of Ennius or to anything in Vergil or Livy that may possibly hark back to the great annalist. She realizes that she is on slippery ground and she proceeds with great care; for how much of occasional resemblances in diction or even in imagery may be due to direct influence of one author upon another is a question on which the fewest critics can ever agree, especially when our acquaintance with one of those authors is so very fragmentary. But when we consider the potent influence of Ennius upon all subsequent Latin writers and recall the notorious lack of originality on the part of Silius writing upon the same subject as Ennius, we realize at once the difficulty of Miss Woodruff's task and the skill with which she meets it. And yet, when all is done, there can be little that is satisfying in her work. Her results are at best problematical or negative, as she herself says at the end: "That any one source can be found for any particular portion of the *Punica* is, I think, impossible. Everything seems to be the result of a combination and blending of many elements taken from many different sources. Not to Ennius or to Livy alone was Silius indebted, but to these authors combined with numerous others. Thus brief phrases and general pictures, as well as those larger conceptions that underlie the structure of the poem as a whole, are traceable now to one predecessor, now to another, and all are so interwoven and confused as to render a separation impossible." *Non liquet*.

WALTER MILLER

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

De Veterum Imprimis Romanorum Studiis Etymologicis, scripsit
FRED. MULLER. Pars Prior. Traiecti ad Rhenum: A. Oosthoek,
1910.

The purpose of this Utrecht dissertation, the subject of which was suggested by Bechtel and Wissowa, is to determine to what extent the etymological studies of the Romans depended on those of the Greeks. The first 98 pages are devoted to a consideration of the theories and practice of the Greeks, from Protagoras to Philoxenus, with a discussion of the origin of the *Poema Etymologicum* of Johannes Mauropus. Among the Romans the four predecessors and successors of L. Aelius Stilo who are deemed worthy of notice (Lucilius, Aurelius Opillus, Hypsicrates, and Nigidius Figulus) are dismissed

in a few words as already satisfactorily treated by others. Stilo, who introduced these studies into Italy, is briefly treated (pp. 101-14). Muller believes that he did not write an *Etymologicum* like those of the Greeks, but that in his editorial and exegetical work he gave many etymologies, and perhaps compiled a glossary. His preference for the principle of *derivatio* to that of *compositio* was gradually acquired through the difference between the Greek and the Latin languages. He was more independent than his contemporaries.

Pp. 115-248 are devoted to Varro, discussing his sources, his principles and their application, his phonetics, and his semasiology. An interesting chapter gives the light thrown by Varro's etymologies on the Roman pronunciation of his day. Muller regards him as critical rather than creative.

There are two appendices, one on the twofold explanations of the same word by Varro, the other on the source of Augustine's *Principia Dialecticae*. Twenty-six theses, touching text criticism and the derivation and meaning of words, are proposed as the result of this thoroughgoing study, which is written in unusually fluent and readable Latin.

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

Cruquius und der Codex Divaei des Horaz. Von Dr. ERNST SCHWEIKERT.
Paderborn: Schöningh, 1910. M. 2.80.¹

As is well known, not only the accuracy of Cruquius but his honesty and good faith have been called in question by some. This verdict is largely based upon errors in his citations of existing codices. Dr. Schweikert, without giving special consideration to the general question of the credibility of Cruquius, makes a careful study of the conclusions which have been drawn from his readings of the Codex Carrionis seu Divaei, the Zulichemianus of Bentley. This codex has been collated, and the readings of Cruquius examined, by Fr. Matthias and J. Häussner, as well as by Holder. Dr. Schweikert submits twenty-five passages, in which these critics regard the evidence against Cruquius as especially strong, to a careful examination, and discusses twelve other passages for special reasons. His conclusion is, that while the dicta of Cruquius must be carefully weighed in each case, the judgment of Bentley is sound: "sane vir probus videtur fuisse Cruquius; neque temere fides ei detrahenda est."

It is evident that Cruquius in his commentary does not give a complete collation of all his codices, and that when he attributes a reading to *omnes codices*, *alii codices*, and the like, we cannot always be sure that V is included. Even the collations of Matthias, Häussner, and Holder are not always in agreement or free from error, and it is unreasonable to expect Cruquius to

¹ This price is that of Band IV, Heft 1, *Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums*, which contains also *Der Aufbau der Ars Poetica des Horaz* by Dr. Alois Patin.